

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-7, 9-11, and 15-22 remain pending in the application. Claims 8 and 12-14 have been canceled; claims 1, 2, 4-7, 9, and 11 have been amended; finally, claims 15-22 have been added. No new matter has been added by virtue of this amendment. The following remarks are believed to be fully responsive to the outstanding Office Action and are believed to place the application in condition for allowance. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the remarks contained herein.

Turning now to the issues raised in the Office Action, claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Petillo et al. (US-2004/0047801, hereinafter "Petillo"); claims 2 and 10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Petillo in view of Taschek (U.S. Pat. 4,155,712, hereinafter "Taschek"); claims 3-8, 12 and 13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Petillo in view of Taschek as applied to claim 2 above, and further in view of Kojima et al. (US-2001/0022960, hereinafter "Kojima"), even further in view of Perry's Chemical Engineers' Handbook (hereinafter "Perry's"). Finally, claims 11 and 14 are objected to as based on rejected parent claims and would be allowed if written in independent form. Applicants respectfully traverse each of the stated rejections and objections and request reconsideration in view of the above amendments and following comments.

Initially, Applicants express appreciation that the examiner has indicated, inter alia, that the subject matter in claim 11 would be allowed if rewritten into independent form. Therefore, Applicants have rewritten claim 11 into independent form, incorporating the subject matter from its base claims 2 and 10. Independent claim 11 is therefore believed to be in condition for allowance.

With respect to claim 1, Petillo fails to disclose "a heat source arranged to vaporize a source of water into a source of steam." Specifically, Petillo teaches combining liquid water with a metal borohydride to create hydrogen. (Petillo, Abstract, Fig. 1 element 104, and Fig. 5). Furthermore, no other reference cited by the examiner, either alone or in combination, discloses the heat source of claim 1. Therefore, claim 1 is patentably distinct over the prior art and is believed to be allowable.

With respect to claim 2, neither Petillo nor Taschek teaches "providing a source of heat arranged to vaporize a source of water into steam." Petillo teaches the combining liquid water with a metal borohydride to create hydrogen. (Petillo, Abstract, Fig. 1 element 104, and Fig. 5). Furthermore, Taschek teaches water stored in a tank and separated from metal hydride by "a porous hydrophobic membrane 4." (Taschek, Col. 2, 67-68). "The porous membrane 4 must permit passage of water vapor but must not permit passage of water, per se, in liquid form." (Col. 3, 1-3). Taschek therefore fails to disclose the use of heat vaporize water, instead relying on pressure to drive cool vapor through the porous membrane 4. (Col. 4, 25-35). The combination therefore falls short of the claimed invention, and claim 2 is believed to be allowable.

With respect to the remaining dependent claims, Applicants contend that: claims 3-7, 9, 10 and 21 are allowable as a result of the dependency from claim 2, claims 15-20 are allowable as a result of the dependency from claim 1, and claim 22 is allowable as a result of the dependency from claim 11. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection.

Applicant has added new claims 15 - 22. Support for claim 15 can be found, for

example, in paragraph 20. Support for claim 16 can be found, for example, in original claim 11. Support for claims 17, 18, and 20 can be found, for example in original claims 3-10 and 12. Finally, support for claims 19, 21 and 22 can be found, for example, in paragraph 17 of the specification.

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this response is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 944-6519.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated:

12/05/05

By:



Ralph E. Smith, Reg. No. 35,474  
(248) 944-6519  
Attorney for Applicants

Ralph E. Smith, Reg. No. 35,474  
CIMS 483-02-19  
DaimlerChrysler Intellectual Capital Company LLC  
DaimlerChrysler Technology Center  
800 Chrysler Drive East  
Auburn Hills, MI 48326-2757  
248-944-6519